

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The senior Senator from Kansas.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GRACE MILLER

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I am here tonight to take a moment to recognize the contributions of a member of my staff, Air Force Maj. Grace Miller, who has spent the last year working in my personal office as part of the U.S. Air Force Congressional Fellowship Program.

Before Grace departs my office at the start of the new year, I express my appreciation to Major Miller for all of her tremendously beneficial and hard work and her dedication to the service of our Nation.

Grace's 15 years of service in the U.S. Air Force developed her leadership capabilities and demonstrate her commitment to serving others. These attributes have made her an invaluable asset to our team as we work to serve Kansans, servicemembers, and veterans.

Before joining my office, Grace's assignments took her around the world in service to our country. Grace earned her commission from the University of St. Thomas in St. Paul, MN. As an aircraft maintenance officer, Grace has served in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation Inherent Resolve, taking her across the Middle East.

Major Miller's commitment to service also extends to teaching. She taught English at the U.S. Air Force Academy, earning her the academic rank of assistant professor and serving as executive officer to the dean of the faculty.

Grace joined our team in January of this year. She, since then, has fully embraced Kansas, its people, and the challenges they face day in and day out. Grace's personal interactions with Kansans and Kansas veterans, in particular, have helped drive meaningful policy in a time when our past and present servicemembers have needed it the most.

She has spearheaded the Senate passage of the "Six Triple Eight" Congressional Gold Medal Act of 2021, which recognizes the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion—the only all-African-American, all-female battalion to be deployed overseas during World War II. The 6888, as this battalion has come to be known, sorted millions of pieces of backlogged mail so troops serving on the frontlines could hear from their families and loved ones from home.

Their efforts boosted morale and directly contributed to our servicemembers' fighting spirit, particularly toward the end of the war.

Grace has been a tireless advocate for these women, and I commend her dedication. The bill currently awaits passage in the House.

Furthermore, throughout the chaotic and disastrous withdrawal from Afghanistan, Grace was an indispensable resource for veterans and Afghan refugees. She continues to assist innocent Afghans seeking refuge from the Taliban's tyrannical hold on the country.

I want to highlight her efforts in this regard. She was tireless and was here morning, noon, and night—always with the goal of trying to make sure those who should be on a plane out of Afghanistan were able to be so. It was an emotional issue and a trying issue and something that she never conceded: the belief that she couldn't make a difference. Man, she made a difference in so many people's lives. It gives me the chills to tell the story of her dedication to this cause. I am so grateful; many Kansans are grateful; many Americans are grateful that she cared so much.

I will be sad that she will be leaving our office at the end of the month, but I know that she will serve the Air Force well as she transitions to the Air Force Legislative Liaison Office in the House of Representatives.

It was a real pleasure having Grace in our office, and I hold her in the highest regard personally and professionally. She is a significant asset to our Nation and to the U.S. Air Force. Grace represents the best of what the Air Force has to offer, and I know she will continue to benefit the future of our Nation.

I hope that her experience in our office is something that lends itself toward her further professional advancement within the Air Force and an understanding of our democratic process.

There is no group of people I hold in higher regard than those who serve our Nation, and I want to reiterate my gratitude to Grace for her service and dedication.

Once again, thank you, Grace, for all you have done for Kansans and for Americans in the year that you have spent in our office. You have been a model of selfless service and leadership. I know that you will continue to do great things throughout your Air Force career and your life of service, wherever that path may lead.

Grace, thank you so much.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Alaska.

#### BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, today, I wanted to rise on the Senate floor and talk about a topic of utmost importance to my State, the great people I have the privilege of representing, and what the Biden administration is

doing to good, hard-working American families in Alaska. It is what I call the anti-Alaska agenda, or the Biden administration's war on working families.

I know that Americans all across the country have felt pain—economic pain, health pain, unfortunately, too many deaths as a result of the pandemic. Right now, we are seeing high energy prices and empty shelves. There has been a lot of suffering in America. We are a resilient people, however.

My State, like many, has been hit very hard by the pandemic, particularly economically—our energy sector, our fishing sector, our tourism sector. And as we are coming out of this pandemic and everybody trying to work together—we all want growth and opportunity in America—we have now been hit with this—with this. This administration has issued, in its first 9 months in office, 20 Executive orders for Executive actions solely focused on Alaska.

I came down to the floor 2 weeks ago to talk about this. It was 19 then. You wait a week or 2 with the Biden administration in Alaska, and it is up to 20. I am sure they have a lot more ready to go. Twenty—there is no State in America that is getting this kind of attention from the Biden administration, and we don't want it.

What I am going to be continuing to ask my Senate colleagues to do—and I am going to start with the President of the United States, who was a U.S. Senator for many years, decades—put yourself in the shoes of the people I represent.

Let's imagine that a Republican administration comes into office and issues 20 Executive orders or Executive actions focused on Delaware—tiny, little Delaware. The Senators from Delaware, including the former Senator, now-President, would be down on the floor of the U.S. Senate raising Cain, raising heck—I don't think I am allowed to swear here—because of this, because they want to stick up for the people they represent. Imagine that.

These Executive orders and actions are not some kind of simple abstractions; they are 20 orders and actions that go to the heart of what Alaskans do in terms of our economy: work, keeping food on the table, keeping lights on in their homes, paying the mortgage, keeping their kids in college, keeping their cultures thriving, keeping our communities from crumbling, particularly in rural Alaska. Some of the poorest communities in America is where this administration is targeting the people I represent.

Very few people in my State—Democrat, Republican, Native, non-Native—support this war against Alaska. This is not a partisan issue back home, and here is why: because real people, real families, real communities are being hurt—your fellow Americans. It has got to stop.

I have demanded a meeting with the President and his team to just walk him through this.

Mr. President, do you know what you are doing to one of your States that you are sworn to defend?

These orders threaten the well-being of my entire State, but they particularly threaten the people who live in rural Alaska, who are dependent on the land and natural resources for so much of their economy, so much of their tax base.

Here is the thing, I know what some of my colleagues or those who are watching are saying: Oh, it is just resource development issues in Alaska.

Well, I will talk about that. It is some of that, but it is not just resource development issues that are happening here. Let me give you one that really burns me up.

We had a bipartisan bill last year, last Congress, to provide what you will now call racial justice, racial equity, to Alaskan Native Vietnam veterans who served their country when most Americans were avoiding service and missed out, because they were overseas fighting for their Nation, on the opportunity to apply for what is called a land allotment. There was a deadline that happened, a complete injustice.

Native Vietnam veterans coming home, not treated well because they are Native, not treated well because they are Vietnam veterans, and then told: Oh, by the way, the land you were supposed to get, you don't qualify.

So we got a bill to pass to say that is an injustice. The previous administration signed it. They were implementing it. And when this administration came into office, the No. 1 issue I asked Secretary Haaland to commit to was to finish getting the Executive order out on these land allotments to implement this bipartisan bill because these Native Vietnam veterans aren't living that long.

The administration delayed it for 2 years. Why? It has nothing to do with oil and gas or mining. Why? These Vietnam vets, many aren't going to live for 2 more years. They did it anyway.

That is 1 of 20. Let me give you another one.

We have had, down in southeast Alaska, the issue of the Tongass—that is the largest national forest in the country. Every elected official—Governor, Senator, Democrat, Republican—in Alaska, the last 30 years, has pressed with the roadless rule, an exemption to the roadless rule, so we can have an economy there; roads for southeast communities. Every elected Governor or U.S. Senator, didn't matter the party, that is how important this was. We were able to get an exemption in the last administration. I appreciate what President Trump did on that.

This administration comes in, and they reverse it. One of the 20. Guess how we, the Alaska delegation, found out about that reversal. A front-page story in the Washington Post. The Secretary of Agriculture wanted to brief the Washington Post and all the extreme environmental groups who want-

ed this before they let the people of Alaska or their representatives know. These are the examples.

And, yes, the list also includes resource development projects. But here is the thing on that—I have a folder full of letters. These are letters from the elected leaders, Tribal leaders, borough leaders, Alaska Native Corp. leaders, Native leaders in my State—dozens of letters. Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation, Native village of Kaktovik—that is a Tribe—City of Utqiagvik, City of Atkasuk, City of Wainwright, Inupiaq Community of the Arctic Slope—that is another Tribe—the Voice of the Inupiat Arctic, these are all Alaskan Native leaders who live in the North Slope, some of whom live in the Arctic National Wildlife area. Every single one of these great leaders in my State, every one, was writing, even begging, this administration not to do this—not to do this. And they ignored them—they ignored them.

This is a letter from Edward Rexford. He is the President of the Native Village of Kaktovik. He wrote to Secretary Deb Haaland after she suspended oil and gas leases in the ANWR, which we passed. What the Secretary did, in my view, was clearly illegal.

Edward Rexford wrote: "You have changed our future with one stroke of a pen without any explanation or consultation with us—the tribe that lives within the Coastal Plain."

His village, Kaktovik, is the only village within the coastal area of ANWR. That is it. There is no group of Americans who should have a greater voice in the development of this area than them. But they didn't even get a phone call—not a phone call, not consultation, Tribal consultation, which is required by law—none of it.

That is all part of the 20 Executive orders and actions that I said are hurting people, hurting communities, hurting families, hurting Native cultures.

I will tell you this: The Biden administration loves to talk about how they are committed to environmental justice and racial equity, but it is with a caveat.

Here is the reality: They want to help unserved minority populations around the country. And I think this is a good goal, but it comes with a caveat. Unless, of course, they are indigenous people of Alaska, then the Biden administration targets them.

Look at this folder. These are communities of color in my State, and all they do is get targeted, not helped; targeted, their economic opportunity. And then the things that most Americans take for granted that don't exist in these communities—clinics, flushed toilets, gymnasiums—all of that comes with economic opportunity. And when you shut it down, you are really hurting indigenous people in some of the most impoverished communities in the country. But I guess they seem OK with that.

I want all of my Senate colleagues to do just a quick thought experiment.

Imagine what it would be like, whether you are a Democrat or a Republican—but just think about it: A Democrat and a Republican administration comes in or you are a Republican and a Democrat administration comes in and changes the future of your State with a stroke of a pen, as Edward Rexford said, for the people you represent. Imagine an administration coming in with 20 Executive orders in 8 months, shutting down your economy as you are trying to get out of a pandemic.

Every Senator here would be mad. Every Senator here would be mad. And the one thing I very much enjoy about serving in this body is we are a collegial body. We have our differences, but I certainly have friends on both sides of the aisle, try to work with everybody, try to be respectful with everybody. The Presiding Officer and I chaired committees together, worked together on a lot of things.

And here is the thing, if a Republican administration came into power and targeted one of my colleague's States with 20 Executive orders in 8 months and whoever it was came to me and said: "Hey, DAN, you know this is unfair. My constituents are really being attacked, really being hurt. Could you reach out to the Republican administration and say: Hey, come on. Tone it down. Geez, Louise, 20 Executive orders in one State," I would help, and I think almost every Senator here would help. That is what we do here.

And I want to say that some of my Democratic colleagues here, when I have talked about this, when I have told them about this, when I have spoken about this, a number of them have come to me and said: "Hey, DAN, give me the list. Give me the list of 20. Maybe I can't help you on every one of them, all of them. Maybe there are some I actually like. But I do want to try and help."

That is what has happened. That is what makes this body a good place. To those Senators, I really want to thank you. And I am going to ask for your help because I would do it for you.

And this is unacceptable. Tens of thousands of people I represent are being hurt by the Federal Government, by the President and his White House. So I appreciate that from my colleagues. And this is, in general, how this body works. It makes this a special place.

But I will say this. Not all Senators have been so gracious and senatorial and collegial. To the contrary, a few of my colleagues are helping lead the charge in the war on Alaska's working families. They seem to be putting a ton of effort into it themselves. I am not sure why, but they spend a lot of their time and energy focused on doing this: shutting down the Alaska economy, hurting working families, and ridiculously and absurdly acting as if they speak for the very people I am privileged to represent, as if they don't have enough to do in terms of helping their own constituents.

So I am going to make an example and give an example of one. The leader of this small group is the senior Senator from New Mexico. Here is a sampling—three letters in the last year and a half he has written, signed, or led, focusing on shutting down Alaska's economy and hurting the great people I have the privilege of representing.

Two of these letters deal with the 1002 area of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge—controversial, no doubt. In 2017, we voted to provide the opportunity for development in that small area, what we call the 1002 area. The President signed it. It came into law.

Now, I know most of my colleagues on the Democratic side didn't agree with that. We have legislation we don't agree with. I accept that. I am still very good friends with so many.

But, afterward, the senior Senator from New Mexico led letters to all the top banks in America and all the top insurance and financial institutions in America and didn't just say don't invest in the ANWR but said "don't invest in any oil and gas development project in the Arctic."

What is that, the Arctic of America? That is my State.

So now you have, as opposed to collegiality, a small group, led by this Senator, writing the biggest banks in America, the biggest financial institutions in America, trying to muscle them, saying: Don't invest anything in Alaska.

That is not what this body is all about. I would never do that to a colleague. I would never write all the banks of America and say: Don't invest in poor communities, Native communities in New Mexico or in the New Mexico oil and gas industry. I wouldn't do that.

Who does that?

Well, unfortunately, a few—not many, a few—Senators are doing that.

Absurdly, this Senator had the audacity, in one of his letters, to try to speak for the people I represent. He put in the letter: The people dependent on the Arctic Refuge don't want you to invest there.

That is patently absurd. Just read the letters from all the people who actually live there, all the people who live there, who overwhelmingly want opportunities for oil and gas development and for jobs and economic opportunity.

You would think, with all of New Mexico's problems, this Senator would focus on his own constituents.

So I reached out to him and the few others who wrote these letters. I have reached out. I wrote my own letter to them saying: Hey, I was disappointed to see you do that. Why didn't you come talk to me? I wouldn't do that to you. And, by the way, what you are doing is really going to hurt my constituents.

This is a letter I wrote to this Senator and a few others: I would appreciate the courtesy of talking about this

before you go do it. You clearly don't understand the indigenous communities that I represent.

I even provided a Wall Street Journal op-ed from the mayor of the North Slope Borough, Harry Brower, the Inupiaq mayor, who had a lot to say to the banks who weren't going to invest in his community.

But I got no response. To the contrary, just a few months ago, this same Senator led a letter to the Secretary of the Interior, Deb Haaland, asking her to shut down a very important energy development in Alaska called the Willow Project. This is that letter—just about 4 months ago.

Let me talk about the Willow Project. The Willow Project is not in a controversial area; it is in the National Petroleum Reserve of Alaska, set aside by Congress decades ago for oil and gas development. Every Native group in Alaska supports this project, all the unions do, 2,000 direct jobs, billions in revenues for some of the poorest communities in America, the lowest emissions of any major oil and gas development project in America.

This is a huge win-win-win for everybody—not even controversial. Yet the senior Senator from New Mexico wrote Deb Haaland saying: Shut down the Willow Project in Alaska.

Why is he doing this, literally trying to kill thousands of Alaskan jobs and impoverish Alaska Native communities?

Do the people in New Mexico know that their senior Senator spends so much time trying to give Alaska oil and gas workers pink slips and impoverish Native communities? I wonder. I wonder.

I thought, for just a moment, maybe I should do something against New Mexico, but then I was like, no; you know what, that is not my style. I wouldn't want to hurt New Mexico oil and gas workers or Native communities. They are all great Americans, I am sure. We are a great country. I wouldn't want to target them the way this Senator is targeting my State, trying to hurt thousands of Alaskan working families.

And it should be emphasized and I want to emphasize, that is not how we work here. That is not what I have seen in my almost 7 years in the U.S. Senate, Senators trying to attack other Senators' States, specifically focusing on hurting working families.

The vast majority of the Senators I know wouldn't do that at all. That is not how business is conducted here in the U.S. Senate. To the contrary, most of us generally try to help each other. We don't always agree; that is for sure. But particularly when States have unique challenges that could hurt their citizens, when my colleagues would come to me, "Hey, Dan, can you help out on this," I usually try to help. But I certainly don't go on offense and try to hurt like this administration is doing and the senior Senator from New Mexico.

But I thought the better course to fight back—because I am going to fight back, OK. I am going to fight back. These are my constituents who are hurting. The better course to fight back against these attacks on Alaskan working families was not to try to hurt New Mexicans but just show this, the rank hypocrisy of what the senior Senator is actually doing and saying.

One of his main reasons, in this latest letter, to shut down Alaska, in trying to deny Federal permits for the Willow oil and gas project, is to "achieve climate goals." OK? That is in his letter to Deb Haaland.

But if you do just a little digging, this Senator seems fine with trying to achieve these goals on the backs of Alaskan workers and Alaska Natives but not on his own constituents, not on the backs of his own constituents—to the contrary.

Guess which State in America has gotten way more Federal oil and gas drilling permits than any other State in the country—guess which one. It is certainly not Alaska. It happens to be New Mexico. It just so happens to be New Mexico.

Guess where the Secretary of the Interior is from. New Mexico. Hmm. Is that a coincidence? I wonder, in their frequent phone calls, when they talk about concerns of climate and shutting down oil and gas in Alaska, if shutting down oil and gas in New Mexico ever comes up.

I am pretty sure it doesn't. How do I know that? Because close to half of all oil and gas drilling permits issued by the Department of the Interior, by New Mexican Deb Haaland, in 2021 have gone to one State. What State is that? New Mexico—2,286 Federal oil and gas drilling permits; almost half of all the permits in the country to one State.

So here is the bottom line. Here is their view. Shut down Alaska, hurt working families in Alaska, supposedly, to help America's climate goals, but then quietly say "drill, baby, drill" in New Mexico, with more permits by far than any other State in the country—almost 2,300. If that is not rank hypocrisy, I don't know what is.

So I am going to start asking questions about this and, by the way, so should the press. I sure hope our friends in the press think that, hmm, there is something a little strange going on here. Clearly, there is hypocrisy happening. But, you know, that happens here occasionally—or maybe more than occasionally. But is there anything else going on?

And I hope the press in New Mexico ask their senior Senator why he is so darn focused on hurting the good people of Alaska—because I wouldn't do that to New Mexican oil and gas workers or New Mexican Native communities.

And finally, I am going to ask questions in another area. The Biden administration is clearly trying to shut down my State. It is there for everybody to see. Everybody back home

knows it. But here is the thing. They can't do it illegally, and they can't do it unethically. And right now there is strong evidence that they are doing just that.

What do I mean? Today, I sent this letter that I would like to be printed in the RECORD to the inspector general of the Department of the Interior.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. MARK LEE GREENBLATT,  
*Inspector General, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.*

INSPECTOR GENERAL GREENBLATT, I write to express my deep concern and to request relevant materials related to several Department of Interior (DOI) appointees that are utilizing their government positions to work on matters directly and substantially related to their previous clients or employers to the benefit of these entities. These actions raise dire conflicts of interest and questions as to these appointees' impartiality under Executive Order 13989 and related United States ethics laws. These individuals have made key decisions to overturn, review, and delay resource development projects and land management plans in Alaska that they and their former employers or clients were actively opposing prior to their appointments. I ask that you supply all relevant information requested below so we may have a full understanding of these appointees apparent and likely conflicts of interest. I further ask that your office consider opening an ethics investigation into the work of these appointees.

Executive Order 13989 requires all appointees to sign a pledge to "not for a period of 2 years from the date of [their] appointment participate in any particular matter involving specific parties that is directly and substantially related to [their] former employer or former clients, including regulations and contracts." Beyond the E.O., 5 CFR §2635.502(a)(2) requires appointees to consult with ethics officials and receive approval prior to participating personally and substantially in a matter where a reasonable person with knowledge of the relevant facts would question their impartiality. It has come to my attention that such apparent conflicts of interest certainly exist for the political appointees discussed below and to the best of my knowledge none have received the requisite approval as required by federal law and regulation.

Ms. Nada Culver currently serves as the Deputy Director of Policy and Programs at the Bureau of Land Management. Prior to her appointment, she worked as Vice President, Public Lands and Senior Policy Counsel at the National Audubon Society and served as the Senior Counsel and Senior Director of Policy and Planning at the Wilderness Society. The Audubon Society was engaged in petitions and lawsuits to halt five Public Land Orders affecting Alaska signed by the Secretary of Interior under the last administration, challenges to the National Petroleum Reserve Alaska (NPR-A) 2020 Integrated Activity Plan (IAP), Environmental Impact Statement on the Willow Projects, challenges to the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge oil and gas leasing program, and the Ambler Road project. It has come to my attention that Ms. Culver has been personally and substantially involved in decisions at the DOI related to delaying PLOs, announcing reviews of the IAP, the Ambler Road project, and the 1002 leasing program. Ms. Culvers impartiality on these matters is plainly questionable, and again her involvement on these issues likely violates ethics laws and regulations.

Prior to her appointment, Ms. Natalie Landreth, presently Deputy Solicitor for Lands, worked for the Native American Rights Fund (NARF). In this position Ms. Landreth counseled and represented NARF in comments and petitions on various projects and management plans under consideration by DOI, including the EIS for the oil and gas leasing program in the 1002 Area and the Willow project. In addition, she counseled an Alaska tribal organization as they sought to prevent the development of the Ambler Road project, which the DOJ, at DOI's behest, moved to stay for further review of the project, in line with petitions from this same organization. NARF's aggressive opposition towards, and request for further review of, a multitude of development projects now currently being reviewed by the DOI raises serious concerns now that their former staff attorney, Ms. Landreth, is a part of the team conducting those very reviews. Since her appointment, it has come to my attention that Ms. Landreth has been directly and substantially involved in the DOI decisions concerning these projects, advancing NARF's agenda without approval from ethics officials.

Prior to her appointment as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Land and Mineral Management, Ms. Laura Daniel Davis worked for the National Wildlife Federation (NWF). As Chief of Policy and Advocacy, Ms. Davis oversaw NWF's campaign to reverse the 1002 Area lease sale order included in the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. NWF also pursued a strategic campaign to invalidate the painstaking work of the DOI on the NPR-A 2020 IAP. Now, in a position of public trust, Ms. Davis has advanced her former employers goals—recalling and reviewing the IAP. Any reasonable person would at the very least perceive a conflict of interest if not outright malfeasance in Ms. Davis invalidating the finalized 2020 IAP as her former employer has advocated for, especially in the absence of an ethics approval.

Finally, Robert L. Anderson, formerly Principal Deputy Solicitor for the Department of Interior, and now Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, was previously the director of the Native American Law Center at the University of Washington School of Law and a staff attorney for NARF. Mr. Anderson was instrumental in establishing the NARF Anchorage Office that now consistently opposes and challenges any and all resource development in Alaska. Mr. Anderson himself has authored a number of articles detailing his personal disdain for the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) and natural resource development. After consistently denouncing the DOI in its handling of tribal and Alaska Native issues, Mr. Anderson has now been appointed as the DOI's chief advocate. The DOI has numerous responsibilities under ANCSA and oversees resource development in much of Alaska. Any reasonable person that has read Mr. Anderson's works would certainly question his impartiality and ability to effectively represent the Department he has long decried.

With such direct and substantial conflicts of interests being ignored, the positions of their former employers and clients are being advanced through a subversion of unbiased analysis, constituting arbitrary and capricious actions, fraud, waste, and abuse, and violation of federal ethics laws and regulations. To the best of my knowledge, none of these appointees have received a waiver from EO 13989 or 5 CFR §2635.502(a)(2) making their violations not only unethical but clearly illegal. When such behavior rears its head there is a responsibility to the public to investigate and expose every improper action taken. The American people expect, and the law demands, impartial decision making by

those privileged to serve in the U.S. government. None of these individuals—as relates to decisions made about Alaska—appear to be abiding by the law.

For that reason, I am requesting the following documents within the next 30 days:

Copies of the signed and dated ethics pledge for each of the above listed officials;

Any and all communications and documentation concerning ethics consultations and waivers issued to the officials discussed above;

Any and all recusals made by the above listed officials;

All internal communications (including Microsoft Teams chats and texts from personal cell phones) concerning the re-opening of the NPR-A IAP to, from, and amongst the above listed officials and the White House;

Any and all communications between the above listed officials and their former employers and clients since their appointments (including Microsoft Teams chats and texts from communications devices);

Any and all communications and opinions to and from the Solicitor's Office concerning the legal sufficiency of the NPR-A IAP and the grounds for re-opening it (including Microsoft Teams chats and texts from communications devices);

A timeline of the conversations and decisions made at the Department of the Interior and among its officials that led to the review of the NPR-A IAP, the 1002 leasing program, Ambler Road project, and the delay of the five PLOs;

A detailed explanation of the purpose and need for re-opening the NPR-A IAP that pinpoints any perceived insufficiencies;

Any and all records of tribal consultations done in connection with the decision to re-open the NPR-A IAP (including Microsoft Teams chats and texts from communications devices);

Public service demands an objective duty to the nation above all else. Government officials have a duty to serve the people and uphold the law they have been entrusted to execute. An impartial administration of the law is essential to safeguarding our democratic values and must never concede to private agendas. I am deeply troubled by the disdain these officials have demonstrated for ethics rules and the institutional damage such disregard has caused. Moreover, I have raised these issues directly with Secretary Haaland and Solicitor Anderson, but have been ignored. Finally, almost all the likely unethical decisions at issue here are focused on shutting down responsible resource development in Alaska, hurting working families throughout my great state. For that reason, I will work tirelessly to bring the full extent of these unlawful improprieties to light.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Here is what I am asking in this letter. There is very strong evidence that at least four senior political appointees at the Department of the Interior who have been involved in many of these 20 Executive orders and Executive actions shutting down my State were actually, in their previous jobs, working on the very same issues and advocating for the very same outcome—meaning they are working with a special interest group to say shut down the Willow Project.

And then when it came to the Interior, they are working on whether or not to shut down the Willow Project. Now, most of us know, if that is true, that is clearly illegal and clearly unethical.

We have documented this letter—four senior Department of the Interior officials, all of whom who are trying to

shut down my State—and I think there is strong evidence that they are violating ethics laws and violating the law. So I have asked for a detailed investigation by the Department of the Interior Inspector General into whether or not these individuals have violated Federal ethics laws in their quest to hurt working families in my State.

Let me conclude with this. I am a supporter of responsible resource development in America of all of the above: energy, wind, solar, oil—in every part of our great country, in Alaska, of course, in New Mexico—all across our great land. And I am a supporter of the great men and women who do this in Alaska and New Mexico and Texas and North Dakota.

What is happening in my State right now, this is just wrong, and I am going to fight. And any other Senator who would be going through what my State is going through, with your constituents being harmed, you would be down on the floor fighting, too.

The vast majority of the U.S. Senators here—Democrats and Republicans—I think deep down in their hearts know that this is just wrong. You don't come in with a new administration and say, Hey, let me target one State and beat the heck out of their working families. It is just wrong.

And I am hopeful that my colleagues here—and I am asking them because we need the help. I have great people I represent—proud, tough people, but I can't fight the whole damn Federal Government when they are focused on shutting you down. So I am hopeful that my colleagues—all of my colleagues; I will share the list of the 20—that you can help me get the Biden administration and some misguided hypocritical U.S. Senators to enact a cease-fire in their war on working families and Native communities in the great State of Alaska.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany S. 1605.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the bill from the Senate (S. 1605) entitled “An Act to designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue in Orlando, Florida, and for other purposes.”, do pass with an amendment.

#### MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to concur in the House amendment.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 1605, a bill to designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue in Orlando, Florida, and for other purpose.

Charles E. Schumer, Tina Smith, Martin Heinrich, Patty Murray, Tammy Duckworth, Tim Kaine, Gary C. Peters, Angus S. King, Jr., Richard J. Durbin, Jack Reed, Brian Schatz, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jacky Rosen, Chris Van Hollen, Jeanne Shaheen, Christopher Murphy, Debbie Stabenow.

#### MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 4880

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to concur in the House amendment with an amendment No. 4880, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] moves to concur in the House amendment with a further amendment numbered 4880.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask that further reading be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

At the end add the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 1 day after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to concur with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4881 TO AMENDMENT NO. 4880

Mr. SCHUMER. I have an amendment No. 4881 to amendment No. 4880, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 4881 to amendment No. 4880.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the names be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date).

On page 1, line 3, strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”.

#### MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 4882

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to refer the House message to the Armed Services Committee with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment No. 4882.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] moves to refer the House message to the Armed Services Committee with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 4882.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask that further reading be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

At the end add the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 1 day after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4883

Mr. SCHUMER. I have an amendment to the instructions, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 4883 to the instructions of the motion to refer.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask that further reading be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

On page 1, line 3, strike “5 days” and insert “4 days”.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4884 TO AMENDMENT NO. 4883

Mr. SCHUMER. I have an amendment No. 4884 to amendment No. 4883, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 4884 to amendment No. 4883.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask that further reading of the amendment be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

On page 1, line 3, strike “4 days” and insert “3 days”.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, December, 8, be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.